

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 were pending in the instant application at the time of the outstanding Office Action. Of these claims, Claims 1, 10, and 19 are independent claims; the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 5, 10, 14, and 19, and have added new Claim 20.

Applicants and the undersigned are most grateful for the time and effort accorded the instant application by the Examiner. The Office is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections present in the outstanding Office Action in light of the amendments presented herein and the following remarks.

Applicants are not conceding in this application the claims amended herein are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications. Applicants specifically state no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

The amendments presented herein find full support in the Specification as written, including the documents incorporated by reference on pages 1 and 2 of the Specification. These documents are fully included in the text in accordance with MPEP § 2163.07(b), which states “an application may attempt to incorporate the content of another document or part thereof by reference to the document in the text of the specification. The

information incorporated is as much a part of the application as filed as if the text was repeated in the application, and should be treated as part of the text of the application as filed.” MPEP § 2163.07(b).

Applicants also note that new dependent Claim 20 has been added, and Claims 5 and 14 have been amended solely in an effort to facilitate expeditious prosecution. Claim 5 now reads:

The apparatus according to Claim 1, wherein said arrangement for supplying multimedia content comprises a working memory which stores *annotated* multimedia files *in an industry standard format*.

Claim 5 (emphasis added). A similar amendment has been made to Claim 14. In addition, Claim 20 now provides:

The apparatus according to Claim 5, wherein said industry standard format is MPEG-7.

Claim 20. These new claims find full support in the specification. (*Specification*, p. 2, line 16; *See documents incorporated by reference, Specification* p. 1, lines 15-18). These dependent claims are allowable over the art of record in their own right, in addition to their dependence from what are believed to be allowable independent claims.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Vegas (Vegas 2.0 Users Manual, 2000, Sonic Foundry, pgs 1-4111). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

As best understood, Vegas teaches a software system for editing audio and video components of multimedia files (*Vegas*, p. 21), utilizing a multi-track system (*Vegas*, pp. 21, 32) and a set of software tools customized for manipulating video and audio data of multimedia files (*Vegas* pp. 29-36).

This stands in stark contrast to the instantly claimed invention wherein either solely video, solely audio or both video and audio components of a multimedia file are annotated (*Specification*, p. 2, lines 10-12), the annotations are saved (*Specification*, p 4, lines 9-10) and previously saved annotations associated with a multimedia file may be displayed (*Specification*, p 4, lines 13-15). Furthermore, *Vegas* fails to teach annotating multimedia files by selecting annotations from predefined sets of descriptors, including nested lists of common objects and groups of objects commonly found in multimedia files, or by entering an annotation into a text box if the desired annotation is not included in a predefined set (*Specification*, p 5, lines 10-13; *Figure 2*).

Nonetheless, solely in an effort to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the application, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 10 and 19 to further clarify the claims of the instant application and to obviate any future rejections using the applied prior art. Thus, independent Claim 1 now recites, *inter alia*,

an arrangement for annotating observations of a selected mode;

wherein said arrangement for annotating observations of a selected mode comprises: an arrangement for assigning semantic, multimedia content-based labels to segments of said observations of a selected mode; and

an arrangement for storing said semantic, multimedia content-based labels with the multimedia content to support retrieval of a segment of said observations of a selected mode based upon its multimedia content;

wherein said arrangement for assigning semantic, multimedia content-based labels comprises performing at least one of:

selecting a label from a predefined set of multimedia content descriptors;

and assigning a new label not present in said pre-defined set of multimedia content descriptors.

Claim 1 (emphasis added). Independent claims 10 and 19 have been similarly rewritten.

By this amendment, Applicants intend to clarify that the instant invention annotates multimedia files and that the annotations may be saved and used to retrieve a specifically labeled section of a multimedia file. This is opposed to the editing of actual video and audio components of multimedia files themselves described in Vegas. In addition, this amendment includes limitations specifying the process of annotating multimedia files as described in the Specification, particularly as described in incorporated document Park et al., "iMEDIA-CAT: Intelligent Media Content Annotation Tool", Proc. International Conference on Inductive Modeling (ICIM) 2001, South Korea, November, 2001. Furthermore, this amendment is intended to clarify that the instant invention accomplishes annotation of multimedia files either through selection from a predefined list of multimedia descriptors or through direct entry of an annotation.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendments clearly distinguish the instantly claimed invention from Vegas. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections using this reference. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 10, and 19 fully distinguish over the applied art and are thus allowable. By virtue of dependence

from Claims 1 and 10, it is thus also submitted that Claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20 are also allowable at this juncture.

Statutory Double Patenting Rejection under 35 USC § 101

Applicants acknowledge Claims 1-19 have been provisionally rejected based upon a statutory type double patenting in light of Claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/325061. In view of the amendments presented herein, Applicants will -- without prejudice -- withhold from commenting on this provisional rejection at this time. Nonetheless, Applicants are not conceding this rejection in this application and specifically state no amendment to any claim herein nor these remarks should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Rejection under 35 USC § 101

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC § 101 as failing to include statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims under 35 USC § 101, but have amended the independent apparatus claim to further emphasize they are directed to statutory subject matter. Claim 1 now recites, *inter alia*, "An apparatus for managing multimedia content, said apparatus comprising: *a processor*; an arrangement for supplying multimedia content..." (Claim 1, emphasis added). It is respectfully requested that the amendments to this claim is sufficient to overcome this rejection.

Request for Telephone Interview

Upon picking up the case, should the Examiner find the claims are not immediately allowable, the Applicants request the courtesy of a telephone interview prior to the issuance of a further Office Action. Such an interview may be arranged by contacting the undersigned at the telephone number shown below.

Conclusion

The “prior art made of record” has been reviewed. Applicants acknowledge that such prior art was not deemed by the Office to be sufficiently relevant as to have been applied against the claims of the instant application. To the extent that the Office may apply such prior art against the claims in the future, Applicants will be fully prepared to respond thereto.

/

/

/

/

/

/

/

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application, including Claims 1-20, is presently in condition for allowance. Notice to the effect is hereby earnestly solicited. If there are any further issues in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Stanley D. Ference III
Registration No. 33,879

Customer No. 47049
FERENCE & ASSOCIATES
409 Broad Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15143
(412) 741-8400
(412) 741-9292 - Facsimile

Attorneys for Applicants